



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/545,785	04/07/2000	Tirdad Sowlati	US 000099	2253	
75	590 06/06/2002				
John C Fox c/o U S Philips Corporation Intellectual Property Department 580 White Plains Road			EXAMINER		
			NADAV, ORI		
Tarrytown, NY 10591			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
• •			2811		
			DATE MAILED: 06/06/2002	DATE MAILED: 06/06/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

g Andrew			W
troad	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/545,785	SOWLATI ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ori nadav	2811	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper rep ch places the applic	cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviewent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in t	fee. The appropriate extended the final Office action; or of the final Office action of the final Office a	ension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) I they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or s	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected clain	ns.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	l amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. $\hfill \square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disapp	proved by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		7.
10. Other:		1000	1 rouns

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

TOM THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner maintains the position that the claimed invention is prima facie obvious over applied prior art (see paper 13)..